

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/933,666	08/22/2001	William R. Herrell III	11011-0002	6634
7	590 10/06/20	04	EXAMINER	
CLARK & B	RODY	NGUYEN, MERILYN P		
Suite 600 1750 K Street,	NW		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Washington, DC 20006			2171	

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	100
Advisory Action	09/933,666	HERRELL, WILLIAM	1 R.
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Merilyn P Nguyen	2171	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addi	ress
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply h places the applicat	tion in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION.	on. See MPEP
fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Officinely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mai	ount of the fee. The appropriate of the final (opriate extension Office action; or
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR) 			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b			
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sin	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of fi	inally rejected claims	S .
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		dered but does NOT	Γ place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			•
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-18</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8.☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ app	roved or b)□ disapproved by t	he Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449)	·	
10.	10	2	
	S/ SUPEP* :	AFFT VALIC XAMIN	IER
		R 2100	

. Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Indicate on record that the Declaration was filed as an Affidavit under 37 CFR 1.131. The evidence is not persuasive and the rejection of claims 1-18 under 103(a) over Shields (US 2002/0032636), in view of Gakidis (US 2002/0095305) is hereby retained. Upon analysis of exhibit, the examiner discovered that nowhere in the exhibit shows the exact or specific date of inventor planning process. Since the effective filing date of the Gakidis is August 21, 2000, and also before the effective filing date of instant invention. Therefore, Gakidis invention was also conceived prior his effective filing date. Without proving the date from exhibit, the Gakidis reference is still good as prior art. Please notes the error of Gakidis effective filling date on page 2, line 3.